UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/286
14 August 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Item 67 of the provisional agenda*

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE IN THE REGION OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Report of the Secretary-General

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1 - 2	2
II.	ACTION TAKEN	3 - 6	2
Annex.	Replies received from Governments		3

* A/51/150.

96-20797 (E) 230896 060996 090996

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 10 of its resolution 50/66 of 12 December 1995, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to continue to pursue consultations with the States of the region of the Middle East and other concerned States, in accordance with paragraph 7 of resolution 46/30 of 6 December 1991 and taking into account the evolving situation in the region, and to seek from those States their views on the measures outlined in chapters III and IV of the study annexed to his report (A/45/435) or other relevant measures, in order to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. In paragraph 11 of the same resolution, the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to it at its fifty-first session a report on the implementation of the resolution.

2. The present report is submitted in response to the request contained in paragraph 11 of the resolution.

II. ACTION TAKEN

3. On 17 January 1996, the Secretary-General addressed a note verbale to the States of the region and other concerned States requesting them to submit their views pursuant to paragraph 10 of the above resolution. Replies were received from Iraq, Israel, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic and are reproduced in the annex to the present report.

4. The Secretary-General has continued to attach particular importance to the issue and has, as in previous years, carried out consultations in various ways with concerned parties within and outside the region to explore ways and means of promoting the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, taking into account in particular the evolving situation in the region.

5. The Secretary-General notes with regret that since his last report the views of the main parties in the region, particularly on the sequence of events which should lead to the establishment of the zone, have not evolved any further. He is also concerned about the apparent impasse in the work of the Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security, which was established in the framework of the multilateral peace process in the Middle East. In the view of the Secretary-General, the Working Group has played a useful role as a forum for discussing a broad range of arms control, disarmament and confidence-building measures, including the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region.

6. The Secretary-General therefore urges all concerned parties to tackle the issue with renewed determination with a view to achieving tangible progress as expeditiously as possible towards establishing a common position. The resumption of such discussions would serve as a confidence-building measure in itself and would also facilitate the overall peace process. In this connection, the Secretary-General once again emphasizes the readiness of the United Nations to continue to provide any assistance deemed helpful in moving the discussions forward.

Annex

REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENTS

IRAQ

[Original: Arabic]

[13 March 1996]

1. Iraq supports the idea of establishing a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the region of the Middle East, given that the region is one of the most dangerous hotbeds of armed conflict in the world, and it does so in particular because Israel is not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, possesses large numbers of nuclear weapons and is developing other weapons of mass destruction and related delivery systems.

2. The functioning of Israel's nuclear programme outside the international non-proliferation regime and Israel's refusal to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its facilities under comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards represent defiance of the will of the international community in this domain. This is despite the many calls made upon Israel by the General Assembly in the resolutions it has adopted annually since 1974, the latest of which is its resolution 50/66, by the Security Council in its resolution 487 (1981) and by many other international forums. In paragraph 3 of the resolution on the Middle East adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Conference notes with concern the continued existence in the Middle East of unsafeguarded nuclear facilities, and in paragraph 4 it calls upon all States in the region that have not yet done so, without exception, to accede to the Treaty as soon as possible and to place their nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards.

3. In paragraph 14 of its resolution 687 (1991), the Security Council notes that the actions taken in implementation of section C of the same resolution represent steps taken towards the goal of establishing in the Middle East a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and all missiles for their delivery and the objective of a global ban on chemical weapons. Although it is now nearly five years since that resolution was adopted, we have seen no serious movement towards the implementation of the provisions of this paragraph by the relevant international agencies, particularly IAEA. The Director General of IAEA was to have continued his visits to the Middle East region in order to acquaint himself with the positions of the parties in the region with regard to the proposed model safeguards and the best ways and means of implementing paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991). To the contrary, however, a frenzied race is under way in the region to develop and acquire weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons.

4. The Israeli position, which attempts to separate the issue of ridding the region of nuclear weapons from its international context and tries to link it with the so-called peace process in the region, is one of deception and

sophistry. There can be no stability and no peace while one of the parties retains its nuclear arsenal, because the maintenance of this situation poses a serious threat to the security and stability of the countries of the region in general and is incompatible with any effort to bring peace to the region.

5. Iraq affirms that Israel must, as a matter of urgency, be required to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to submit its nuclear facilities to the international inspection regime as a fundamental step towards making the Middle East region a zone free of the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction. We should also like to affirm once more that Iraq's position is part and parcel of the inter-Arab position, which regards the requirement for Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and place its nuclear and other facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards as a precondition for any serious endeavour to transform the Middle East region into a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction under the auspices of the United Nations.

ISRAEL

[Original: English]

[25 June 1996]

1. Israel has advocated in the past and continues to support the concept of establishing in the Middle East, in due course, a credible and mutual verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone, freely negotiated by all States of the region.

2. Israel fully subscribes to the statements made by the Secretary-General in his reports, namely that:

> "... a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot be conceived of or implemented in a political vacuum, separate from the process of mutual reconciliation." (A/48/399, 25 October 1993, para. 22)
>
> "... Confidence must be built on all sides: ... confidence that military solutions to political problems are excluded ... Most important of all, there must be progress in solving the fundamental conflicts in the region. Without such progress, technical measures in the nuclear area or on other security problems will hardly be given serious thought ..." (A/45/435, 10 October 1990, para. 110)
>
> "... A radical transformation, step by step, must be effected in the military and political relationships of the entire area ..." (ibid., para. 151)

3. It is Israel's conviction that the achievement of a "radical transformation in the military and political relationships of the entire area" must be based on peace among all States of the area. The process of the achievement of peace demands the building of confidence, political reconciliation, based on agreements among all States of the area, economic cooperation as well as arms control and disarmament regimes. This is by necessity a step-by-step process.

4. Israel strongly believes that, as far as regional security and arms control is concerned, the establishment of confidence-building measures is an essential first step. Such measures, to be tested over time, will enable all the States of the region to gain the confidence necessary to approach mutually agreed arms control measures with a greater sense of equanimity.

5. All regional arms control measures should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process. Meaningful arms control negotiations, where priority is assigned to weapon systems which experience has proved to be destructive and destabilizing, can follow a proven and durable peace among the States of the region and reconciliation among the peoples of the region.

6. Unfortunately, we have not yet reached this stage. At the present moment, many of the prerequisites for meaningful negotiations on arms control in the Middle East are as yet not in place.

7. Until such time when the necessary requirements are met, it is incumbent upon the parties that currently participate in the Arms Control and Regional Security process to identify and pursue an agenda that can contribute to the attainment of the desired political climate and thus pave the way to productive arms control negotiations.

8. Israel believes that the existing forum of the Middle East Multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security, which was established by the Madrid Conference, is the most promising forum to pursue the negotiations between the parties.

9. It is Israel's conviction that nothing should be done to treat any issue in isolation from the comprehensive framework of the peace negotiations. Unfortunately, attempts in the past to do so have blocked the road to peaceful accommodation and might shake the delicate balance achieved through direct negotiations. Therefore, restraint and caution are strongly recommended. The peace negotiations, bilateral as well as multilateral, should therefore be respected and in no way eroded.

SAUDI ARABIA

[Original: Arabic]

[1 April 1996]

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has promoted the idea of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East by taking a number of steps in this regard, most significantly:

By acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons;

By refraining from producing, acquiring, obtaining or possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons in its territory by any third party;

By openly and firmly supporting the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East through the position it adopted with respect to the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and by unreservedly supporting the resolutions of the United Nations on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East;

By participating actively in the multilateral working group on arms control and regional security in promoting mutual confidence and security in the Middle East.

2. Saudi Arabia supports all United Nations efforts for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. It calls upon all States in the region, particularly those that have not yet acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, to take practical and urgent measures under the relevant General Assembly resolutions to achieve this goal by acceding to the Treaty and placing all of their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

3. Despite Israel's outward support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East, as expressed in its support for the relevant General Assembly resolutions, its sophistries come to the fore when it links the question of addressing the issue of nuclear weapons in the region with the peace process, with comprehensive negotiations involving all of the parties, with the functioning of the working group on arms control and regional security and with the pursuit of a gradualist approach to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East beginning with confidence- and security-building measures. In practice, this means the postponement of consideration of a matter that is of the utmost importance for the region to some undefined time in the future. This is what Israel really wants.

4. Although, in their resolutions on this subject, the United Nations, IAEA and the conferences of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference have repeatedly urged the States of the region not to develop, produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices or to permit their stationing in their territories or territories under their control, Israel still refuses to respond to such appeals. It still refuses to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and it continues to display a lack of enthusiasm for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

5. The Israeli position with respect to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East is well known and is not new. The proposals made by Israel are tantamount to attempts to justify its position on not acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and its failure to provide any active support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. This stems from its policy of deferring consideration of the issue in order to use it to exert pressure on the peace process and to tilt the future balance of power in the region in its favour.

6. The Israeli position of rejecting nuclear disarmament in practice will be maintained as long as Israel's leaders believe that their possession of nuclear weapons is a major factor in deterring and intimidating neighbouring States.

7. Israel's possession of nuclear weapons is incompatible with its declared desire for peace and reflects an Israeli strategy that aims for hegemony over the region.

8. The possession of nuclear weapons by any State in a sensitive region such as the Middle East constitutes a source of concern not only for the peoples of the region but for the world as a whole.

9. Saudi Arabia urges the international community and the Security Council to require Israel to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to implement the IAEA resolutions urging it to place all of its nuclear facilities under the Agency's full-scope safeguards. Israel must declare that it renounces its nuclear armament and must present a full inventory of its stocks of nuclear weapons and nuclear materials to the Security Council and IAEA. These steps are indispensable for the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction, and principally nuclear weapons, in the region of the Middle East. This is basic to the establishment of a comprehensive and just peace in the region.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

[Original: Arabic]

[16 April 1996]

The Syrian Arab Republic affirms its commitment to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. It expresses its deep concern at Israel's insistence on being alone in the region in having a military nuclear programme that is outside the international non-proliferation regime. It is of the view that the continued operation of this programme and Israel's refusal to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to place its nuclear facilities under full-scope safeguards cause a dangerous imbalance, constitute a threat to regional security, detract from the credibility and universality of the Treaty and prevent the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/51/287
14 August 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fifty-first session
Item 72 (c) of the provisional agenda*

REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY: REGIONAL CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES

Report of the Secretary-General

I. INTRODUCTION

1. By its resolution 50/71 B of 12 December 1995, the General Assembly, inter alia, reaffirmed its support for the programme of work of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and urged States members of the Committee to implement the specific measures they had already adopted within the framework of the Committee's work programme. The Assembly also requested me to continue to provide assistance to States members of the Committee and to report to the Assembly at its fifty-first session on the implementation of the resolution. The present report, focusing on the activities of the Committee in the period since the adoption of resolution 50/71 B, is submitted in fulfilment of that request.

2. During the reporting period, the work of the Committee intensified and expanded significantly. Consultations and more formal meetings took place at various levels as States members of the Committee continued to address the persistent threats to peace and security in the Central African subregion with a view to promoting sustainable measures of confidence-building and arms restraint and preventing further turmoil in the area.

3. I followed developments in the subregion closely and attended in person the first meeting of heads of State and Government of States members of the Committee which was held at Yaoundé on 8 July 1996. I reaffirmed to the Committee the support of the United Nations for its goals and objectives. On

---

* A/51/150.

23 June 1996, prior to the summit, I met at Geneva with Mr. Destin Arsène Tsaty-Boungou, Foreign Minister of the Congo, in his capacity as President of the Bureau of the Committee. He briefed me on the Committee's priorities and plans with regard to the implementation of its programme of work. In addition, Mr. Prvoslav Davinić, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs in the Department of Political Affairs of the Secretariat, represented me at the Committee's eighth ministerial meeting held at Yaoundé from 15 to 19 April 1996, and delivered a statement on my behalf. That meeting was chaired by His Excellency Mr. Simon Achidi Achu, Prime Minister and Head of Government of Cameroon. The Secretariat also provided substantive support to the ministerial meeting of the Committee's Bureau held at Brazzaville on 14 and 15 June 1996.

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE MINISTERIAL AND SUMMIT MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE IN 1996

4. Concern over continued tensions and conflict in the subregion and the seemingly growing threat that the situations of violence and instability could deteriorate further, especially in the Great Lakes area, greatly influenced the discussions of the Committee during the reporting period. It was recognized from the outset of the eighth ministerial meeting that the increasingly dangerous situation in the subregion needed to be examined by member States at the highest political level with a view to evolving a concrete subregional plan of action.

5. Both at the eighth ministerial meeting at Yaoundé and at the Bureau meeting at Brazzaville, it was felt that while the primary responsibility for resolving the political and security problems in the Central African subregion rested with the Governments and peoples of the countries concerned, concerted action at the subregional and wider levels was required to promote lasting solutions. The summit meeting therefore offered a historic opportunity to begin to chart a strategy for effective subregional cooperation on issues of peace and security. At the same time, the ministers reaffirmed the important need for continued and intensified international support, especially for efforts to halt the proliferation of weapons in Central Africa, to diffuse potentially catastrophic situations and to meet the critical humanitarian needs of millions of refugees and displaced persons in the area.

6. At their meeting on 8 July 1996, the heads of State and Government of Committee member States set out a course of action on subregional security cooperation and outlined a number of specific measures to be taken to that end. They emphasized the urgent need to avert future conflicts, both within and between States in the subregion.

7. Among the specific measures agreed upon by the heads of State and Government were the following:

(a) The creation, promotion and support of good governance and participatory democracy;

(b) The organization, under United Nations auspices, of seminars to promote a sustainable culture of peace and democratic responsibility within the armed forces, the paramilitary forces (gendarmerie) and the police forces of States members of the Standing Advisory Committee;

(c) The adoption and implementation of subregional confidence-building measures, including in particular the signature and effective observance of the Non-Aggression Pact among Central African States;

(d) The implementation, with the assistance of the United Nations and the international community as a whole, of a disarmament programme designed to deal with the problem of the uncontrolled proliferation of weapons;

(e) The establishment, under United Nations auspices, of a subregional early-warning mechanism to monitor developments in Central Africa with a view to preventing potential crises or tensions from degenerating into armed conflicts;

(f) The designation, within the armed forces and the paramilitary and police forces of States members of the Committee, of specialized units for possible deployment with United Nations and/or Organization of African Unity (OAU) peace missions;

(g) The convening, on a regular basis, of meetings of heads of State and Government, within the framework of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, to examine peace and related security issues in the subregion.

8. At the summit, the heads of State and Government of the following eight States members of the Committee formally signed the Non-Aggression Pact: Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Sao Tome and Principe and Zaire. They also requested their ministers to elaborate, urgently and jointly, the practical modalities for an effective programme to curb the proliferation of weapons in Central Africa and to examine with United Nations officials concrete ways and means to bring the proposed early-warning mechanism into existence and to ensure its functioning.

9. Cognizant of the financial and other material resources required to implement fully and effectively their programme for subregional stability, the Central African leaders called for enhanced cooperation with bilateral and multilateral donors in a shared partnership for peace and security in the subregion. They conveyed their deep gratitude to those donors that had already contributed or planned to contribute to the trust fund set up by the United Nations to receive voluntary contributions to help finance the implementation of the programme of work of the Committee.

III. OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMMES IN 1996

10. Member States continued to set up national committees to ensure effective follow-up at the national level to advance the work and the objectives of the Committee. They also continued to take the necessary practical steps to

designate within their respective armed forces specialized units for possible deployment with future United Nations and/or OAU peace operations.

11. With regard to the peace units, the General Assembly, by its resolution 50/71 B, welcomed with satisfaction the decision by the States members of the Committee to establish such units. It also welcomed the participation by some of those States in the peace operations deployed in the subregion and called upon States Members of the United Nations and governmental and non-governmental organizations to promote and to facilitate the holding of a training programme on peace operations in the subregion with a view to strengthening the capacity of such units. The Secretariat, in cooperation with the International Peace Academy and with funding from the Government of Japan, will shortly organize in Yaoundé, the first training programme on peace operations for senior military and civilian officials of Central African States. The session is designed to train officials who, upon their return home, would serve as instructors and help prepare the units set up within their respective national forces.

12. There were growing indications, in 1996, of increasing efforts to foster transparency and inter-State cooperation on military and security matters in the subregion. States members of the Committee, at their eighth ministerial meeting in April, agreed in principle on the confidence-building value of a subregional arms register to monitor weapons acquisitions and transfers in Central Africa with a view to their control and reduction. Stressing their conviction that instability in any African country threatened the security of the region as a whole, they also showed growing interest in contributing to the peaceful resolution of existing conflicts in Central Africa. Members of the Committee's Bureau plan to visit Angola, Burundi, Rwanda and Zaire to convey the support and encouragement of other Central African States to such efforts in Angola and the Great Lakes region. The President of the Bureau is also scheduled to hold discussions with the former Tanzanian President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, in his capacity as the OAU peace facilitator for the Great Lakes region. The Committee has stressed the importance of a coordinated African response to facilitate the quest for a satisfactory solution to the complex problems in that part of the Central African subregion.

13. States members of the Standing Advisory Committee continued to reaffirm in 1996 their support for the democratization process in the subregion. In my meeting at Geneva on 23 June with the President of the Bureau, he informed me that members of the Committee, based on their conviction that lasting peace in the subregion would be facilitated in the long term under conditions of democracy and good governance, had decided to hold a subregional conference in December 1996 on the topic "Democratic institutions and peace in Central Africa". The meeting, scheduled to take place in Brazzaville, will examine, among other aspects, the rule of law and the role of the armed forces in a democratic system. The President of the Bureau also requested United Nations support and cooperation for the organization of the conference.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL ASPECTS

14. In its request to me to continue to provide assistance to States members of the Standing Advisory Committee, the General Assembly, in its resolution 50/71 B, also asked me to establish a trust fund to which States Members of the United Nations and governmental and non-governmental organizations might make additional voluntary contributions for the implementation of the programme of work of the Committee. On 18 March 1996, I established the United Nations Trust Fund for the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and invited Member States and governmental and non-governmental organizations to contribute to it. States members of the Committee pledged, shortly thereafter, to contribute to the Trust Fund, which has already received contributions from a number of Governments. The Governments of Cameroon and the Congo also made contributions in the form of material and other practical support for the organization of the Yaoundé summit on Central African security in July and the June meeting at Brazzaville of members of the Bureau of the Committee. In addition, the Government of Japan has made a contribution of $600,000 and several other Governments and organizations have indicated that they are considering the appeal for contributions.

15. In the face of the continuing financial crisis confronting the United Nations, ministerial meetings of the Committee have been reduced to one per year for the current biennium. Financial requirements for any additional meetings and activities during the biennium will have to be met from voluntary contributions.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

16. The first meeting at the level of heads of State and Government of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa, and the Declaration issued on that occasion (A/51/274, annex), represent a milestone in the life of the Committee and in the quest for lasting peace and security in this turbulent subregion.

17. As developments in Burundi and throughout the Great Lakes region demonstrate, Central Africa continues, in 1996, to be confronted by enormous politico-military and security challenges undermining prospects for its socio-economic recovery and progress and threatening its long-term peace and stability. The political will shown by the subregional security summit was an unmistakable sign of commitment by States in the area to tackle at the highest political level and in a concerted manner the complex problems involved. I share the leaders' sense of concern and, indeed, anxiety. The potentially explosive nature of conflicts in Central Africa means that instability in any part of the subregion could affect the security of the area as a whole.

18. By their signature of the Non-Aggression Pact, the reaffirmation of their commitment to disarmament and their decision to pursue the creation of a subregional early-warning mechanism, the heads of State and Government have laid a strong foundation for a more promising future for Central Africa. The signature of the Pact by all States in the subregion and the effective and concrete implementation of the decisions taken by the heads of State and

Government would contribute to making the promise a reality. At the same time, I welcome the Standing Advisory Committee's collective recognition that the peace and security of the subregion can be assured in the long term only through respect for human rights, democratization, the rule of law and socio-economic development.

19. I greatly welcome and encourage the organization of the first training seminar in Central Africa to help prepare units designated by States members of the Committee for possible deployment in peace operations. I share the General Assembly's support for the decision by the States concerned to set up the units and to participate in future operations. That decision demonstrates a strong commitment by Central African countries to take concrete actions to promote subregional confidence-building and security cooperation. I also support the appeal to States Members of the United Nations and governmental and non-governmental organizations to help, through training, in strengthening the capacity of the Central African peace units and thus render them operational on short notice, when needed. I wish to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to the Government of Japan for its generous financial contribution which made the organization of the first training programme possible and to the Government of Cameroon for hosting it and providing local logistical support.

20. The activities of the Standing Advisory Committee in 1996 have demonstrated, once again, that it is an instrument of much promise in efforts to end the scourge of violence and destruction in one of Africa's most unstable subregions. The Committee continues to show a great sense of responsibility and seriousness in handling delicate issues and challenges. It should therefore continue to receive the support and encouragement of the international community. I urge member States and the international community as a whole to contribute as generously as possible to the United Nations Trust Fund set up to enable the Committee implement its programme of work.